

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 remain pending in the application.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection:**

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Van Loo, U.S. Patent 6,260,174. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**The cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims.** The teachings of Van Loo were presented in the previous office action response.

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part:

“a record of one or more previous requests from the first master device and at least one additional master device, wherein the record is adapted to indicate which of the first master device and the at least one addition master device has had a previous request denied” (Emphasis added).

Similarly, Applicant's independent claim 12 recites, in pertinent part:

“a retry pool comprising a plurality of positions adapted to indicate which of the plurality of master devices have had a previous request denied by the slave device” (Emphasis added).

Independent claims 18, and 26 recite similar combinations of features.

Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion of this combination of features in Van Loo. In the office action, the Examiner contends that Van Loo teaches a retry pool comprising a plurality of positions adapted to indicate which of the plurality of master devices have had a previous request denied by the slave device, and cites Van Loo at column 6, lines 22-36, columns 8-9, and Fig. 2 (SCIQ, SCOQ). Applicant respectfully

disagrees with the Examiner's characterization, and can find no teaching or suggestion of a retry pool having a plurality of positions to adapted to indicate which of the master devices had a previous request denied by the slave device (as recited in claim 12, and similarly recited in claim 1 presented above). The Examiner also contends that Van Loo teaches a queue adapted to indicate the order in which the slave device has granted at least one previous request (Col. 3, line 41 to col. 6, line 27, queue 160, 170 of Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 43-44, Van Loo). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization as well, and can find no teaching or suggestion in these citations of a queue, a record, or any other type of storage mechanism configured to store any information regarding previous requests granted by the slave, much less an indication of the order in which at least one previous request has been granted.

Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to column 2, lines 27-30 of Van Loo, which states:

“The elimination of (advance or overflow) feedback signals in the present flow control system reduces the interface latency, since there is no extra handshake, no rescheduling or rearbitrating for resources, and no retries by the master.”  
(Emphasis added).

In light of this disclosure, Applicant submits that the method and apparatus taught by Van Loo does not teach a record or a retry pool as recited in claims 1 and 12, respectively (and similarly recited in claims 18 and 26), as there would be nothing to store in the retry pool since there are no retries by the master (and no master having a previously denied request).

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Van Loo does not anticipate claims 1-33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-56600/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,

Erik A. Heter  
Reg. No. 50,652  
AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,  
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 9/26/2005